

## THE RICHMOND DISPATCH.

BY THE DISPATCH COMPANY.

The DAILY DISPATCH is delivered to subscribers at FIFTEEN CENTS per week, payable to the carrier weekly. Mailed at \$1.00 per annum; \$5 for six months; \$2.50 for three months; 50c. for one month. Price per copy 2 cents, except the Sunday issue, which is 5 cents per copy.

THE WEEKLY DISPATCH at \$1 per annum.

The SUNDAY DISPATCH at \$1.50 per annum, or 5c. for six months.

Subscriptions in all cases payable in advance, and no paper continued after the expiration of the time paid for. Send post-office money-order, check, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail will be at the risk of the sender. Subscribers who desire their post-office changed must give their old as well as their new post-office. Sample copies free.

## ADVERTISING RATES.

HALF IN ADVANCE OR LESS.

1 time	50
2 times	1.00
3 times	1.50
4 times	2.00
5 times	2.50
10 times	5.00
1 month	10.00
3 months	25.00
6 months	50.00
1 year	100.00

Business notices, payable in advance (5 words or less) 25

Above rates are for "every-day" or advertisements running consecutively.

Reading notices in reading-matter type, five lines or less; in nonparel leaded, 10 lines or less, 50c.

Card of rates for more space furnished on application.

All letters and telegrams must be addressed to THE DISPATCH COMPANY. Rejected communications will not be returned.

UP-TOWN OFFICE, 43 EAST BROAD STREET.

WEST-END OFFICE, PARK-PLACE PHARMACY, Belvidere and Main streets.

MANCHESTER OFFICE, 128 HULL STREET.

TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1895.

## The Boycott.

Grand-Master Sovereign's boycott does not appear to have commended itself to his followers as a wise measure. "The boycott is not dead," but we do not expect those of them who survive to take up his scheme and advocate it, either in his order or before the general public.

As we said in our last issue, Mr. Sovereign might as well boycott his dinner. The reader can understand why Mr. Sovereign has boycotted the notes of the national banks.

He favors the policy of providing by law that all the currency in use in this country shall be issued by the National Government. He has no doubt a sort of crude notion that the United States would under such a system save a large amount of interest every year, though the fact is that the national banks receive no interest from the National Government which would not be paid to some person if the present system of banking were abolished.

But if Grand-Master Sovereign and his followers deem it their duty to boycott the notes of the national banks, they must have somehow or other come to the conclusion that there is an abundance of currency in this country. To boycott the notes of the national banks—that is, to boycott them successfully—would be to remove them from the channels of trade.

True, this would be to follow the example of the Irish mob who made a bonfire of the notes of a bank which refused or was unable to redeem its notes in specie; but all the same it would be what Grand-Master Sovereign knowingly or unknowingly calls for when he demands that the notes of the national banks shall be boycotted. He will no doubt claim that the government could soon flood the country with greenbacks; but it will strike the average man as unwise to burn up the national-bank notes in order to make a place for more greenbacks.

Again: Grand-Master Sovereign's scheme for boycotting the existing national-bank notes would of course lead him into the policy of boycotting all the notes of any new State-bank system which might be resorted to hereafter, such for example as the State-bank system advocated by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

In fine, Mr. Sovereign's boycotting project has not one single feature to commend it to public approbation. It is a wild scheme. It has already come to naught. Let the people study it, and then ask themselves how they would like to entrust the currency of this country to such financial wisecracks.

## Senator Sherman a Bimetallist.

A correspondent of the Cincinnati Commercial interviewed Mr. Sherman last Saturday on the silver question, and obtained the following candid statement of his views. We quote:

"Now, Senator, you know the people of Ohio look to you as an oracle on monetary matters. Can you tell me some thing so simple that all can understand, yet so clear that none may misunderstand?"

"Well, we are for bimetallism. That ought to be clear and brief enough."

And then the venerable senator explained his bimetallism as follows:

"The Republican party in the national platform of 1892 demanded good money of equal purchasing power, whether coined of silver or gold, or composed of United States notes and national-bank notes, based upon the credit of the United States, maintained at par with coin. This is the bimetallist policy. There we stand to-day. I hope and trust there we will stand to-day."

"We will seek the co-operation of all nations and of all parties in maintaining the parity of gold and silver coins. If they will not co-operate with us in this policy, the Republican party can, and I do hope will, do it alone. Good money and plenty of it is as important to all people as equality of rights and privileges."

So Mr. Sherman strongly favors international bimetallism, or co-operative silver coinage, and will fight for it, but will advocate coinage by this country alone if he cannot secure the former.

In 1888 there died in Richmond, Va., a man whom about two thirds of the late Congress should have taken for their ward. His name was William A. Smith. He once resigned a seat in Congress because he thought he had not seen enough poverty to represent his constituents. From the Milwaukee Sentinel.

Richmond has been the home of a large number of great men, and Smith is an old and honored name amongst us; but we never before heard of this distinguished gentleman. And such merit as his could not have been hidden under a bush.

John Ambler Smith, a very young man, represented this district in Congress for one term—1873-1875, we believe—but he did not resign. On the contrary, he sought reelection. And failed. No, Richmond is not entitled to the honor awarded by the Sentinel. Try Richmond, Me., or Richmond, Ind., or Richmond, Tex.

Major E. B. Stahlman, who has just made known his purpose to retire from the command of the Southern Railway and Steamship Association, was in Germany, September 2, 1892. He

came to this country when quite a young boy and began the railroad business at the lowest round possible—taking his shovel and going with the construction corps that was at work on a branch of the Baltimore and Ohio. He began at this work in 1853, and continued a year with the grading corps, but he made use of his opportunities and studied engineering under the assistant engineer in charge. He was soon made clerk to the agents of the branch line. In 1862 he became assistant to the chief of the tunnel and bridge department of the Louisville and Nashville. From 1865 to 1870 he was agent and cashier of the Adams Express Company at Chattanooga, and it was there that he first began to learn the traffic business of railroads. For twelve years he was with the Louisville and Nashville as agent. From October, 1885, to 1890, he was third vice-president of the Louisville and Nashville system. In January, 1892, he was elected commissioner of the Southern Railway and Steamship Association, having been out of service only two years, spending most of that time in Europe.

**Mirabile Mirabile.**  
Solomon Marable is a great liar. First one tale and then another was told by him as to how Mrs. Pollard was murdered. But we take it that the Lunenburg jury did not depend upon Solomon's testimony alone when they convicted his accomplices, the women.

The jury would hardly have found the women guilty upon Solomon's unsupported testimony, and if they had done so the Judge wouldn't have permitted the verdict to stand. We may be sure that there was important evidence supporting Solomon's statement. The telegraphic reports of the trial sent the Dispatch substantiate this view. Furthermore, not one of the accused established an alibi.

It is, of course, unfortunate that the prisoners, especially the women, had no counsel, but as far as he could with propriety do so, the presiding judge looked after the interests of the accused, and quite as well as the average attorney could have done.

There are cases which are appealable from the County Court to the Circuit Court, and from the Circuit Court to the Supreme Court of Appeals. And then, if the Supreme Court should decide to award a new trial, a change of venue might be ordered by the County Court of Lunenburg. The cases in that event might be sent to another county in another circuit, and then the same old round of appealing might be gone through with again.

It is, of course, quite unlikely that we shall see these cases take such a course; it would cost a deal of money, and the accused are penniless.

We only state the law as to appeals in capital cases, so that our people may observe how complicated are the ways of criminal procedure in Virginia.

It may be that public apprehension that Solomon is not to be trusted at all and that the corroborative evidence was insufficient may lead some lawyer to volunteer to take the case of one or two of the women to a higher court, but as for Solomon, no mantle of charity is going to be woven to cover his crime-burdened shoulders and bloody hands.

**The Chitral Programme.**  
Lord Rosebery recently delivered a sort of post-mortem utterance regarding the policy of his Ministry respecting Afghanistan as involved in the occupation of Chitral. He said that the instructions to the Governor-General of India were that at the earliest possible moment consistent with safety and dignity the British should withdraw from Chitral, and expressed the hope that Lord Salisbury would endorse that programme.

No doubt Salisbury will show his predecessor that much courtesy, but when will the programme be carried out? As far back as 1896 Salisbury announced that the British would evacuate Egypt as soon as they had achieved the work they had undertaken in that country. But they have never, it seems, arrived at the conclusion that they have achieved that work, and if they desire to hold on to Chitral they will hardly find it "consistent with safety and dignity" to let go.

A British declaration of purpose to evacuate territory has, as a rule, a string to it. Salisbury can without fear of compromising himself promise to adhere to Rosebery's "assurance" as to Chitral, seeing that the usual string precaution has not been neglected in the case.

**Mr. Gorman Defended.**  
Hon. J. C. Clarke, once of Maryland, now of Alabama, has come out in a long letter in defence of Senator Gorman. Here is one little paragraph from Mr. Clarke's letter:

"True Democrats will render even-handed justice to public servants. Give them credit for what they do that is right, and hold them responsible for their public acts which are wrong. Hear them in defence of their cause. Strike if you will, but examine their records and see if they deserve the condemnation applied to them."

If Mr. Gorman is such a man as his enemies represent him to be, how does it happen that with the administration opposed to him, the so-called independents trailing him, and the so-called Democrats trailing him, he nevertheless keeps his "grip" upon the leaders of the grand old Democratic party in his own State?

**Good News from the South.**  
The New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle of Saturday last has the following encouraging item. We quote: "We are informed by leading bankers that there is some inquiry from the West and South for loans. The increasing activity in those sections is rapidly absorbing the surplus in local banks, and the demand for crop-maturing purposes will soon be felt at this centre. Anticipating that there is already a tendency to hardening of rates."

Dr. J. P. Gibbons, of Syracuse, originator of a system of resuscitating victims of electric shock, says that he had partly resuscitated the electrocuted negro Johnson after he was pronounced dead, but that the work of Auburn prison interfered and prevented further efforts. The Doctor declares Taylor was sufficiently revived to talk and walk, and was then killed by the warden with drugs.

Our street-car company might do a good stroke of business by fitting up one or two handsome open cars to be hired out to excursion parties. These trolley-car excursions are all "the go" in Philadelphia, and do much to break the monotony of summer life in the City of Brotherly Love.

The United States commissioners who were sent to Nicaragua to make an inspection of the canal route returned to New York on Sunday. Not one of them would give out for publication what conclusions they have reached.

In consequence of a newspaper interview given out by Mr. E. St. John, vice-president of the Seaboard Air-Line, in which it was intimated that the Seaboard

was being persecuted by the Southern Railway Company, there has been an exchange of letters between Mr. St. John and President Samuel Spencer, with the result that Mr. Spencer says:

"Your reply to my letter, therefore, must be regarded as an evasion of the question, and places me under the disagreeable necessity of saying to you that if you intended in your interview as published to charge by implication or otherwise that the Southern Railway Company or its officers have at any time taken any action for the purpose of depressing the securities of the Seaboard Air-Line, such charge or implication is wholly and entirely untrue and unfounded."

What comment Vice-President St. John will make upon this letter of Mr. Spencer's remains to be seen, but it is clear that there is no very good feeling between the head men of these two important lines.

**Democrats More Hopeful.**  
We think there can be no doubt that the Democrats are more hopeful now than they were a few months ago. The cry of "hard times" has lost its potency, and has been succeeded by a new condition of things which promises to show to the Democrats the path they must pursue if they expect or desire to elect the next President and Congress.

Ex-Senator Camden, of West Virginia, a shrewd, sharp politician of the practical kind, sums up the political situation in a few words. He says that two or three months ago he would not have given a copper for the chances of the Democratic party, but that since then there has been a marked change in public sentiment, due largely to the improvement in business prospects throughout the country. He adds that the Democratic party in West Virginia (West Virginia raises many cattle) have gone up, as have wheat, iron, and cotton. "All these things redound to the credit of the Democratic party," says Mr. Camden, and his belief is that that party will triumph in 1896.

From the far-off Northwest comes a like hopeful utterance. That section has been supposed to be ready to cut loose from the Democratic party on the silver question, and a serious defection was feared. But the St. Paul Globe tells us that there is a revival of courage and confidence everywhere discernible amongst Democrats, and that this revival has a solid foundation. "Those Democrats who had abandoned all hope of success ten years ago are now becoming confident of it."

In fact, our St. Paul contemporary claims that the silver question no longer threatens to destroy the integrity of the Democratic party. All good Democrats should, at least, come to the conclusion that the condition of things now existing would not justify the Democrats in dividing this year on the silver question, nor on what that paper styles "the larger question of the currency."

Just here let us call the attention of our readers to the fact that the Globe, an administration organ to the backbone, testifies that the Democrats stand with the currency policy commended by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. This policy involves the divorce of the government from banking, but calls for strict Federal supervision of the projected new State-bank system.

Returning to Virginia, we quote from that sterling Democratic paper, the Staunton Vindicator, as follows:

"When last Congress adjourned there was not one Virginia Democrat out of a hundred—you might say a thousand—who had the slightest hope of electing a Democratic President in 1896. Now there's not one out of a hundred who doesn't hope to elect him. The times have improved, the tariff is working well, and gotten more ballast in the Treasury. There is more skilled employment all over the country, wages that shrink so in the hard times are being raised everywhere, common labor is finding work, wool under the new tariff has about doubled its price, wheat is 20 cents better than it was this time last year, beef holds its price well—all things are better."

"All this compared with last year. Compare next year with this, next July. The change will be still more marked—there won't be a peg to hang a hard time complaint on, anywhere. And then the Democrats will be as keen as greyhounds for victory in the presidential race."

These are only straw, but they show the direction in which the wind is blowing. It is not too late for the Democrats to snatch victory from the hands of the Republicans.

A police raid was made recently on one of several fashionable night-clubs in London, opening at midnight and closing at 6 A. M., and a hundred men and women, all in evening dress, were captured. Among them were a United States Senator, a congressman, a prominent law official of an Eastern State, and an American police official. All but the proprietor and servants of the establishment, however, were released.

Anent the alleged Eustis interview, published in the Paris Figaro, the London Saturday Review says: "Whether it was the Bourbon or the Irish rebel, it was evidently too strong for the Ambassador," and by the same token we take it for granted that the Review man knows all about the effect of that which enters the mouth to steal away the brains.

New York is learning by practical experience about the tornadoes it has been accustomed to associate with Texas. It had another one of them Sunday. Can the unusual dryness about the metropolis just now have anything to do with the phenomenon?

A consular report states that retail trade in France, Germany, and Belgium is being ruined by auction sales, so that our merchants in America are not alone in their misery as regards the evil—possibly necessary evil—referred to.

Ex-President Harrison says the American flag should be planted in the heart of every American citizen. Would he be content with a fruitage of "Old Glory" merely?

Thirteen two-venturesome bathers were saved from drowning at Atlantic City Sunday, which fact seems to disprove the assertion that thirteen is an unlucky number.

We are glad to see that the little Irish joker has not entirely disappeared from the British pack. He will play his part as heretofore, though in a less important way.

Twelve houses were engulfed by an unaccountable sinking of the ground at Unaccub, Bohemia, Sunday, and ten people are missing in consequence.

The leading question before the country seems to have assumed this form—What is bimetallism, anyhow?

There are symptoms of a rare old Irish wake in connection with the death of Home Rule.

It took 14 pages of solid type to publish Chicago's delinquent tax list the other day, says the malicious Cincinnati Commercial.

## Dispatch's Fashion Hint.



Design for silk waist of chine taffeta. The front is turned back on the bust and shoulders with folded revers lined with a different color; the drapery is drawn beneath the belt, two full ends falling below; the front and girdle is of velvet; elbow sleeves. Seven yards of single-width material.

## Two Drunken Ministers Stain.

Sunday Night, July 21, 1895.

To the Editor of the Dispatch: Multitudes in this country and Europe studied to-day this very sad story—and, indeed, to father, mother, and two brothers—while the Israelites were at the Mount receiving the law, Nadab and Abihu, two sons of Aaron, just consecrated, got drunk and offered "strange fire." They kindled the incense not from the sacred fire always burning in the tabernacle, contrary to God's express command, and were struck dead before the altar to show His righteous indignation. I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle to minister.

This terrible violation was to show, God said, "the difference between the holy and unholy." Do all men to-day distinguish rightly between things sacred and profane, holy and unholy, between temperance and intemperance? I am reminded of the two drunken ministers who were present also, not to mourn the fate of their two brothers, but that the two second cousins should wrap them up just as they fell in their priestly robes, and bury them without the camp. Then came the command that henceforth no one present should take any wine or strong drink when about to go into the tabernacle